UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE NASHVILLE DIVISION

BRIDGEPORT MUSIC, INC., et al.,)
Plaintiffs,)
v.)) NO. 3:01-0698
EMI APRIL MUSIC, INC., et al.,) Jury Demand) Judge Campbell/Brown
Defendants.)

ORDER

The plaintiffs have requested a reconsideration of the Magistrate Judge's previous ruling (Docket Entry No. 23) in the case of <u>Bridgeport Music v. Songs of All Nations</u>, No. 3:01-0703.

The plaintiffs point out in their present request for a ruling on their motion for a partial reconsideration (Docket Entry No. 35) that Judge Campbell has now denied the various defendants' motions to dismiss and has held that the averments of fraud in the first amended complaint are sufficient for the purposes of Fed.R.Civ.P. 9(b) and 12(e). (See Docket Entry No. 22, Case No. 3:01-0699, which is posted on the Court's webpage). The District Judge's ruling is simply a ruling that at this early stage of the case the allegations are sufficient to proceed forward. Undoubtedly as discovery progresses there will be more substantive motions dealing with the issue of fraud and whether the plaintiffs

This document was entered on the docket in compliance with Rule 58 and/or Rule 79 (a),

FRCP, on ///////by

will be able to toll the three-year statute of limitations on their infringement claims.

Given the massive nature of these cases, the Magistrate Judge believes that his ruling on these various discovery issues as set forth in Docket Entry No. 23, Case No. 3:01-0703, at footnote 2, is correct. A full copy of this Order is available on the Court's webpage, www.tnmd.uscourts.gov, under Selected Opinions, Bridgeport Music, Inc. Cases, with the title Order: Motion to Compel Discovery entered October 24, 2001.

Since these cases are so massive and since there is a need for a fixed trial date, unlimited discovery is simply not possible. From various motions being filed for extensions of deadlines by both plaintiffs and defendants, it is apparent that all sides are having a great deal of difficulty digesting the information they are seeking and receiving at the present time. The Magistrate Judge believes that the present order allowing six years worth of information is a reasonable compromise. In the event that the defendants prevail on their three-year statute of limitations theory, the plaintiffs will have gotten more information than they would otherwise be entitled to. In the event that the plaintiffs eventually prevail on their fraud theory and are able to toll the statute of limitations, there will be

sufficient time at that point to order additional discovery. These cases are set to be tried in series, and additional discovery can therefore be staggered to accommodate a trial schedule rather than having the information produced en masse in 476 cases at the present time.

The Magistrate Judge realizes that the information sought by plaintiffs might be useful in settlement negotiations, and should any of the parties wish to undertake serious settlement negotiations in any particular case or a test case, the Magistrate Judge would consider ordering the additional discovery in that case for the limited purposes of settlement negotiations.

The Clerk will post this Order on the Court's webpage under Selected Opinions, Bridgeport Music, Inc. Cases, with the title Order: Denial of Additional Discovery Re: Fraud Claims.

It is so ORDERED.

JØE/B. BROWN

Úni/ted States Magistrate Judge